arXiv:1602.07267v1 [cs.DM] 23 Feb 2016

Towards a closure operator for enumeration of maximal tricliques in tripartite hypergraphs

Dmitry I. Ignatov

Abstract

Triadic Formal Concept Analysis (3FCA) was introduced by Lehman and Wille almost two decades ago, but up-to-date even though that different researchers actively work on this FCA branch, a proper closure operator for enumeration of triconcepts, i.e. maximal triadic cliques of tripartite hypergaphs, was not introduced. In this paper we show that the previously introduced operators for obtaining triconcepts and maximal connected and complete sets (MCCS) are not always consistent and provide the reader with the definition of a valid closure operator and the associated set system.

Keywords: Triaidic Formal Concept Analysis, Closure operator, triadic hypergraph

1. Introduction

Pattern mining is one of the most important Data Mining areas and often relies on fundamental notions from theoretical computer science and algebra like fixpoints, closure operators and lattices (Zaki & Hsiao, 2005; Boley et al., 2010). Formal Concept Analysis (Ganter & Wille, 1999) can be considered as an elegant algebraic framework to deal with (frequent) closed sets of objects and their attributes (formal concepts or maximal bicliques) by means of two closure operators formed by Galois connection over these sets.

Recent studies showed that there are efficient algorithms for building all formal concepts not only in binary object-attribute case but in ternary (TRIAS) (Jäschke et al., 2006) and n-ary case (Cerf et al., 2009).

Several researchers tried to develop a proper closure operator for triadic (Trabelsi et al., 2012) and n-ary case (Spyropoulou et al., 2014). However, detailed analysis in this paper shows that concept-forming operator in (Trabelsi et al., 2012) is not always monotone on triset systems. An interesting approach from (Spyropoulou et al., 2014) can be used to enumerate formal triconcepts as maximal fixpoints of a set system of closed and connected sets (CCS) but suffers from phantom hyperedges because of lossy k-partite graph encoding. In this paper, we show how to define a proper triset system for concept forming operator from (Trabelsi et al., 2012) that makes it closure operator, describe the family of closure operators of this type and investigate their properties, and prove that there is no associated closure operator on the whole triset system for given tricontext. We also introduce a notion of (maximal) switching generator – a triset resulting in different closed patterns that contain it. In addition we show how to deal with lossy hyperedge encoding and phantom edges to generate triconcepts as maximal connected and complete sets.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. In section 2 we recall basic definition from FCA and its polyadic extensions and reproduce necessary definitions and propositions from (Spyropoulou et al., 2014). In section 3 we discuss current concept and closed CCS forming operators with a focus on their inconsistency conditions. Section 4 reports our main results and section 5 concludes the paper.

2. Multimodal and multirelational closed patterns

2.1. Formal Concept Analysis and its polyadic extensions

First, we recall some basic notions from Formal Concept Analysis (FCA) (Ganter & Wille, 1999).

Let G and M be sets, called the set of objects and attributes, respectively, and let I be a relation $I \subseteq G \times M$: for $g \in G,\ m \in M$, gIm holds iff the object g has the attribute m. The triple $\mathbb{K} = (G, M, I)$ is called a *(formal) context*.

A *triadic context* $\mathbb{K} = (G, M, B, Y)$ consists of sets G (objects), M (attributes), and B (conditions), and ternary relation $Y \subseteq G \times M \times B$ (Lehmann & Wille, 1995). An incidence $(g, m, b) \in Y$ shows that object g has attribute m under condition b.

An *n-adic context* is an $(n+1)$-tuple $\mathbb{K} = (X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n, Y)$, where Y is an n-ary relation between sets $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ (Voutsadakis, 2002).

2.1.1. Concept forming operators and formal concepts

If $A \subseteq G$, $B \subseteq M$ are arbitrary subsets, then the *Galois connection* is given by the following *derivation operators*:

$$\begin{aligned} A' &= \{m \in M \mid gIm \text{ for all } g \in A\}, \\ B' &= \{g \in G \mid gIm \text{ for all } m \in B\}. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

If we have several contexts, the derivative operator of a context (G, M, I) is denoted by $(.)^I$.

The pair (A, B), where $A \subseteq G$, $B \subseteq M$, $A' = B$, and $B' = A$ is called a *(formal) concept (of the context K)* with *extent* A and *intent* B (in this case we have also $A'' = A$ and $B'' = B$).

The concepts, ordered by $(A_1, B_1) \geq (A_2, B_2) \iff A_1 \supseteq A_2$ form a complete lattice, called *the concept lattice* $\underline{\mathfrak{B}}(G, M, I)$.

2.1.2. Formal concepts in triadic and in n-ary contexts

For convenience, a triadic context is denoted by (X_1, X_2, X_3, Y). A triadic context $\mathbb{K} = (X_1, X_2, X_3, Y)$ gives rise to the following diadic contexts

$\mathbb{K}^{(1)} = (X_1, X_2 \times X_3, Y^{(1)})$, $\mathbb{K}^{(2)} = (X_2, X_1 \times X_3, Y^{(2)})$, $\mathbb{K}^{(3)} = (X_3, X_1 \times X_2, Y^{(3)})$,

where $gY^{(1)}(m, b) :\Leftrightarrow mY^{(2)}(g, b) :\Leftrightarrow bY^{(3)}(g, m) :\Leftrightarrow (g, m, b) \in Y$. The derivation operators (primes or concept-forming operators) induced by $\mathbb{K}^{(i)}$ are denoted by $(.)^{(i)}$. For each induced dyadic context we have two kinds of such derivation operators. That is, for $\{i, j, k\} = \{1, 2, 3\}$ with $j < k$ and for $Z \subseteq X_i$ and $W \subseteq X_j \times X_k$, the (i)-derivation operators are defined by:

$$Z \mapsto Z^{(i)} = \{(x_j, x_k) \in X_j \times X_k | x_i, x_j, x_k \text{ are related by Y for all } x_i \in Z\},$$

$$W \mapsto W^{(i)} = \{x_i \in X_i | x_i, x_j, x_k \text{ are related by Y for all } (x_j, x_k) \in W\}.$$

Formally, a triadic concept of a triadic context $\mathbb{K} = (X_1, X_2, X_3, Y)$ is a triple (A_1, A_2, A_3) of $A_1 \subseteq X_1, A_2 \subseteq X_2, A_3 \subseteq X_3$, such that for every $\{i, j, k\} = \{1, 2, 3\}$ with $j < k$ we have $(A_j \times A_k)^{(i)} = A_i$. For a certain triadic concept (A_1, A_2, A_3), the components A_1, A_2, and A_3 are called the extent, the intent, and the modus of (A_1, A_2, A_3). It is important to note that for interpretation of $\mathbb{K} = (X_1, X_2, X_3, Y)$ as a three-dimensional cross table, according to our definition, under suitable permutations of rows, columns, and layers of the cross table, the triadic concept (A_1, A_2, A_3) is interpreted as a maximal cuboid full of crosses. The set of all triadic concepts of $\mathbb{K} = (X_1, X_2, X_3, Y)$ is called the concept trilattice and is denoted by $\mathfrak{T}(X_1, X_2, X_3, Y)$. However, the concept trilattice does not form partial order by extent inclusion since it is possible for the same triconcept extent to have different combinations of intent and modus components (Wille, 1995; Lehmann & Wille, 1995).

One may introduce n-adic formal concepts without n-ary concept forming operators. The n-adic concepts of an n-adic context $(X_1, \ldots, X_n, Y)$ are exactly the maximal n-tuples $(A_1, \ldots, A_n)$ in $2^{X_1} \times \cdots \times 2^{X_n}$ where $A_1 \times \cdots \times A_n \subseteq Y$ with respect to component-wise set inclusion (Voutsadakis, 2002). The notion of n-adic concept lattice can be introduced in the similar way to the triadic case (Voutsadakis, 2002).

2.2. Maximal closed connected sets

The authors of (Spyropoulou et al., 2014) formalized a multi-relational database (MRD) as a tuple $\mathbb{D} = (E, t, \mathcal{R}, R)$ where E is a finite set of entities that is partitioned into k entity types by a mapping $t : E \to \{1, \ldots, k\}$, i.e., $E = E_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup E_k$ with $E_i = \{e \in E \mid t(e) = i\}$. Moreover, $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \{\{i, j\} \mid i, j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}, i \neq j\}$ is a set of relationship types such that for each $\{i, j\} \in R$ there is a binary relationship $R_{\{i,j\}} \subseteq \{\{e_i, e_j\} \mid e_i \in E_i, e_j \in E_j\}$. The set $\mathcal{R}$ then is the union of

all these relationships, i.e., $\mathcal{R} = \bigcup_{\{i,j\} \in R} \mathcal{R}_{\{i,j\}}$. This definition allows relationship types can be many-to-many, one-to-many, or one-to-one, depending on how many relationships the entities of either entity types can participate in. The authors do not allow relationship types between an entity type and itself, but it can be modeled by having two copies of the same entity type and a relationship type between them.

Definition 1 *(Completeness) A set $F \subseteq E$ is complete if for all $e, \tilde{e} \in F$ with $\{t(e), t(\tilde{e}\} \in R$ it holds that $\{e, \tilde{e}\} \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\{t(e),t(\tilde{e})\}}$.*

Definition 2 *(Connectedness) A set $F \subseteq E$ is connected if for all $e, \tilde{e} \in F$ there is a sequence $e = e_1, \ldots, e_l = \tilde{e}$ with $\{e_1, \ldots, e_l\} \subseteq F$ such that for $i \in \{1, \ldots, l1\}$ it holds that $\{e_i, e_{i+1}\} \in R$.*

It implies that a subset of size larger than one can be connected only if it contains entities of at least two different types.

A set $F \subseteq E$ is a Complete Connected Subset (CCS) if it satisfies both connectedness and completeness.

A maximal Complete Connected Subset (MCCS) is a CCS to which no element can be added without violating connectedness or completeness.

For a database $\mathbb{D} = (E, t, \mathcal{R}, R)$ the set system of CCSs, is defined as $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{D}} = \{F \subseteq E \mid F \text{ is connected and complete}\}$. From an algorithmic point of view, the property of strong accessibility means that for two CCSs $X, Y \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{D}}$ with $X \subseteq Y$, it is possible to iteratively extend X by one element at a time, only passing via sets from the set system and finally obtain Y. Formally, for a set system $F \subseteq 2^A$, where A is the ground set, and a set $F \in \mathcal{F}$, let us denote by $Aug(F) = \{a \in A \mid F \cup \{a\} \in \mathcal{F}\}$ the set of valid augmentation elements of F. Then $\mathcal{F}$ is called strongly accessible if for all $X \subset Y \subseteq A$ with $X, Y \in \mathcal{F}$ there is an element $e \in (Aug(X)\ X) \cap Y$.

Theorem 1 *For all relational databases $\mathbb{D} = (E, t, \mathcal{R}, R)$, the set system $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{D}}$ of CCSs is strongly accessible.*

Specifically for the set system $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{D}}$ of CCSs, and given a relational database $\mathbb{D} = (E, t, \mathcal{R}, R)$, the set $Aug(F)$ corresponds to the following set: $Aug(F) = \{e \in E \mid F \cup \{e\} \text{ is complete and connected}\}$. Note that for the sake of efficiency $Aug(F)$ can be recursively updated.

To define a closure operator for the set system $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{D}}$ the authors make use of the set of compatible entities which is defined as follows:

Definition 3 *(Compatible entities) For a relational database $\mathbb{D} = (E, t, \mathcal{R}, R)$ the set of compatible entities of a set $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{D}}$ is defined as $Comp(F) = \{e \in E | F \cup e \text{ is complete}\}$.*

Definition 4 *(g operator) For a relational database $\mathbb{D} = (E, t, \mathcal{R}, R)$ the operator $g : \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{D}} \to 2^E$ defined as $g(F) = \{e \in Aug(F) \mid Comp(F \cup e) = Comp(F)\}$.*

Proposition 1 *For all relational databases $\mathbb{D} = (E, t, \mathcal{R}, R)$, the codomain of the g operator is the set system $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{D}}$ of CCSs and g is extensive and monotone.*

Proposition 2 *For all relational databases $\mathbb{D} = (E, t, \mathcal{R}, R)$ with the property that $e \in E$ such that $\{e\} \cup E_i$ is complete and connected for an $i \in t(E)$, the operator g is idempotent.*

Corollary 1 *For all relational databases $\mathbb{D} = (E, t, \mathcal{R}, R)$, with the property that $e \in E$ such that $\{e\} \cup E_i$ is complete and connected for an $i \in t(E)$, the operator g is a closure operator.*

Note that, the technical requirement in Proposition 2 for g being idempotent may be fulfilled by adding an isolated vertex $\{e_0\}$ to E_i for all $E_i \subseteq E$ and $e \in E \setminus E_i$ where $E \cup \{e\}$ is CCS.

Example 1 *In Figure 1 on the left one can see the violation of idempotency of $g(\cdot)$ since $g(\{r_1, r_2, p_1\}) = \{r_1, r_2, p_1, f\}$ and $g(g(\{r_1, r_2, p_1\})) = \{r_1, r_2, p_1, f, u_1, u_2, u_3\}$. On the right graph of Figure 1 the idempotency fulfills since $g(\{r_1, r_2, p_1\}) = g(g(\{r_1, r_2, p_1\})) = \{r_1, r_2, p_1\}$. It happens since for the left graph*

$$Comp(\{r_1, r_2, p_1\} \cup f) = \{r_1, r_2, p_1, f, u_1, u_2, u_3\} = Comp(\{r_1, r_2, p_1\}),$$



Figure 1: Idempotency of $g(\cdot)$

but for the right one

$$Comp(\{r_1, r_2, p_1\} \cup f) = \{r_1, r_2, p_1, f, u_1, u_2\} \neq Comp(\{r_1, r_2, p_1\}) = \{r_1, r_2, p_1, f, u_1, u_2, u_3\}.$$

3. Pitfalls of recent candidates for closure operators in triadic case

3.1. Non-monotonicity of TriCons concept forming operator

To simplify further considerations of tri-sets, triadic concepts and multirelational databases both as tuples and sets, we introduce two interrelated operators.

Definition 5 *Let $\mathbb{K} = (G, M, B, I)$ be a formal tricontext. A triple (X, Y, Z) is called a triset of $\mathbb{K}$ iff $X \times Y \times Z \subseteq I$.*

Note that Cerf et al. (2009) define a triset of $\mathbb{K}$ differently: $X \times Y \times Z \subseteq 2^G \times 2^M \times 2^B$. We keep the former definition to work with $h(\cdot)$ in the original setting (Trabelsi et al., 2012).

Note that according the definition of Cartesian product, if at least one of the sets X, Y or Z is $\emptyset$ (Simovici & Djeraba, 2008), then $X \times Y \times Z = \emptyset$, so $\emptyset \subseteq I$ and (X, Y, Z) is a triset. However, trisets $(X, Y, \emptyset)$ and $(X, \emptyset, Z)$ are different even though $X \times Y \times \emptyset = X \times \emptyset \times Z = \emptyset \subseteq I$.

Definition 6 *For a formal tricontext $\mathbb{K} = (G, M, B, I)$ and any triple $(X, Y, Z) \subseteq 2^G \times 2^M \times 2^B$ (e.g. triconcept) of $\mathbb{K}$ operator $flat : 2^G \times 2^M \times 2^B \to 2^{G \sqcup M \sqcup B}$ is defined as follows: $flat(X, Y, Z) = X \sqcup Y \sqcup Z$.*

Definition 7 *For a given formal n-context* $\mathbb{K} = (E_1, \ldots, E_n, I \subseteq E_1 \times \ldots \times E_n)$ *(or multi-relational database* $\mathbb{D} = (E, t, \mathcal{R}, R)$*), where* $E = flat(E_1, \ldots, E_n)$*, and set* $S \subseteq 2^E$ *operator tuple* : $2^E \to 2^{E_1} \times \ldots \times 2^{E_n}$ *is defined as follows:* $tuple(S) = (E_1 \cap S, \ldots, E_n \cap S)$.

Triple compositions $tuple(\cdot)$ and $flat(\cdot)$ operators forms identity operators $tuple(flat(tuple(\cdot))) = id_S(\cdot)$ and $flat(tuple(flat())) = id_T(\cdot)$ over sets and tuples respectively.

Note that for trisets $t_1 = (A_1, B_1, C_1)$ and $t_2 = (A_2, B_2, C_2)$, $t_1 \sqsubseteq t_2$ means that $A_1 \times B_1 \times C_1 \subseteq A_1 \times B_1 \times C_1$, i.e. every triple $(a, b, c) \in (A_1, B_1, C_1)$ is in (A_2, B_2, C_2). It follows that $\sqsubseteq$ is not antisymmetric, since e.g. $(X, Y, \emptyset) \sqsubseteq (X, \emptyset, Z)$ and $(X, \emptyset, Z) \sqsubseteq (X, Y, \emptyset)$, but $(X, Y, \emptyset) \neq (X, \emptyset, Z)$. Thus every preorder $(\mathcal{T} \subseteq 2^G \times 2^M \times 2^B \cap I, \sqsubseteq)$ have all equivalence classes of cardinality 1 except $[\emptyset] = \{(\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset), \ldots, (G, \emptyset, \emptyset) \ldots, (\emptyset, M, B)\}$ of cardinality $2^{|G||M||B|} - 1$.

Definition 8 *Let* $S = (X, Y, Z)$ *be a tri-set of* $\mathbb{K} = (G, M, B, I \subseteq G \times M \times B)$. *A mapping* $h : 2^G \times 2^M \times 2^B \cap \to 2^G \times 2^M \times 2^B$ *is defined as follows:*

$h(S) = \{(U, V, W) \mid U = \{g \in G \mid \forall m \in Y, \forall b \in Z : (g, m, b) \in I\}$ $\wedge V = \{m \in M \mid \forall g \in U, \forall b \in Z : (g, m, b) \in Y\}$ $\wedge W = \{b \in B \mid \forall g \in U, \forall m \in V : (g, m, b) \in Y\}$

Note that every triconcept is a maximal or closed triset, i.e. a triset that cannot be extended by triples from I being a triset.

Proposition 3 $h(\cdot)$ *is extensive and idempotent by* $\sqsubseteq$ *on* $T = \{t \mid t \text{ is a triset of } \mathbb{K}\} = \{t \mid t \text{ is a triset of } \mathbb{K}\} = \{(X, Y, Z) \in 2^G \times 2^M \times 2^B \mid (X, Y, Z) \subseteq I\}$ *and every fixpoint* f *of* h *(i.e.* $h(f) = f$*) is a triconcept of* $\mathbb{K}$.

Proof. One can find the proof of extensivity and idempotency in (Trabelsi et al., 2012). It is easy to see that every formal triconcept is a fixpoint of $h(\cdot)$ and every triset (X, Y, Z) is transformed by $h(\cdot)$ to the triconcept $((Y \times Z)^{(1)}, ((Y \times Z)^{(1)} \times Z)^{(2)}, ((Y \times Z)^{(1)} \times ((Y \times Z)^{(1)} \times Z)^{(2)})^{(3)}$. Indeed, all formal

triconcepts should be listed since a triset is allowed to be a triple with at least one component being $\emptyset$. $\square$

Theorem 2 *For a given tricontext* $\mathbb{K} = (G, M, B, I \subseteq G \times M \times B)$ *and its associated triset system* $T = \{(X, Y, Z) \in 2^G \times 2^M \times 2^B \mid (X, Y, Z) \subseteq I\}$ *operator* h *is not monotone in case there exist two different tri-concepts,* $c_1 = (X, Y_1, Z_1)$ *and* $c_2 = (X, Y_2, Z_2)$*, of* $\mathbb{K}$ *such that* $Y_1 \subset Y_2$ *and* $Z_1 \supset Z_2$*.*

Proof. W.l.o.g. $Y_1 \subseteq Y_2$ and $Z_1 \supseteq Z_2$ by antiordinal dependencies. Consider tri-set $s = (X, Y_1, Z_2)$.

$s \sqsubseteq c_1 \Rightarrow h(s) = c_2 \not\sqsubseteq h(c_1) = c_1$ $\square$.

Example 2 *For tricontext in Figure 2 it follows* $x = (\{u_1, u_2\}, \{t_1\}, \{r_1\}) \sqsubseteq y = (\{u_1, u_2\}, \{t_1\}, \{r_1, r_2\}) \Rightarrow h(x)) = (\{u_1, u_2\}, \{t_1, t_2\}, \{r_1\}) \not\sqsubseteq h(y) = (\{u_1, u_2\}, \{t_1\}, \{r_1, r_2\})$.

	t_1	t_2	t_3
u_1	×	×	
u_2	×	×	
u_3			

r_1

	t_1	t_2	t_3
u_1	×		
u_2	×		
u_3			

r_2

Figure 2: A small example with Bibsonomy data

Definition 9 *A relation* $R \subseteq G \times M$ *is called a* ***Ferrers relation*** *iff there are subsets* $A_1 \subset A_2 \subset A_3 \ldots \subseteq G$ *and* $M \supseteq B_1 \supset B_2 \supset B_3 \supset \ldots$ *such that* $R = \bigcup_i A_i \times B_i$.

R is called a Ferrers relation ***of concepts*** *of* (G, M, I) *iff there are formal concepts* $(A_1, B_1) \leq (A_2, B_2) \leq (A_3, B_3) \leq \ldots$ *such that* $R = \bigcup_i A_i \times B_i$.

It is well known that a relation $R \subseteq G \times M$ is a Ferrers relation iff the concept lattice $\underline{\mathfrak{B}}(G, M, R)$ is a chain.

Proposition 4 *Any Ferrers relation $R \subseteq I$ is contained in a Ferrers relation of concepts of (G, M, I).*

Corollary 2 *Let $\mathbb{K} = (G, M, B, I)$ be a formal tricontext, and $\mathbb{K}_X^{MB} = (M, B, I_X)$ such that $(m, b) \in I_X$ iff $(g, m, b) \in I \cap X \times M \times B$, and I_X be Ferrers relation of concepts of $\mathbb{K}_X^{MB}$. Operator h is not monotone for every pair of trisets (X, Y, Z) and (X, Y_i, Z_i) such that $Y \subseteq Y_i$, $Z \subseteq Z_j$, and $(Y_i, Z_i) \leq (Y_j, Z_j)$ are concepts of $\mathbb{K}_X^{MB}$.*

3.2. Inconsistency of MCCS closure

3.2.1. Lossy hyperedge encoding and phantom edges

In case of k-partite graph encoding we can meet information loss in a form of new hyperedges.

Example 3 *Imagine that we have three hyperedges $\{u, t, r_0\}, \{u, t_0, r\}, \{u_0, t, r\}$, and then encode them as edges in 3-partite graph, we obtain*

$$\{u, t\}, \{u, r_0\}, \{t, r_0\}, \{t_0, r\}, \{u, r\}, \{u, t_0\}, \{t, r\}, \{u_0, r\}, \text{ and } \{u_0, t\}.$$

Since we now have $\{u, t\}, \{u, r\}$, and $\{t, r\}$ in our graph, we should inevitably decode a new hyperedge, $\{u, t, r\}$. See Figure 3.



Figure 3: A phantom hyperedge as a structure loss

Taking the last fact into account and following the definition of MCCS or applying $g(\cdot)$ to respective CCS, we should obtain in general case a different or extra pattern(s) in addition to triconcepts in k-partite encoding. Thus in Example 3 there are three MCCS, $\{u, t_0, t, r\}$, $\{u, u_0, t, r\}$, and $\{u, t, r_0, r\}$, that are different from set representation of formal triconcepts, $\{u, t_0, r\}$, $\{u_0, t, r\}$, $\{u, t, r_0\}$, of the initial tricontext respectively. If one would add edge $\{u, r_0, t\}$, then new MCCS $\{u, u_0, r_0, t, t_0\}$ appears.

3.2.2. Closed but non-maximal patterns

As one can see from example in Table 1 the technical condition for idempotency of $g(\cdot)$ is fulfilled. The corresponding tripartite graph is depicted in Figure 4

Table 1: A small example with Bibsonomy data

	t_1	t_2	t_3
u_1	×	×	
u_2	×	×	
u_3			

r_1

	t_1	t_2	t_3
u_1	×		
u_2	×		
u_3			

r_2

	t_1	t_2	t_3
u_1			
u_2			
u_3			

r_3

However, for CCS pattern $X = \{u_1, u_2, t_1, r_1\}$ $g(X)$ coincides with X but it is not maximal. Indeed, there exist two maximal closed and connected patterns corresponding to triconcepts, $X \cup t_2 = \{u_1, u_2, t_1, t_2, r_1\}$ and $X \cup r_2 = \{u_1, u_2, t_1, r_1, r_2\}$.

It is so, since $Comp(X) = X \cup \{t_2, r_2\}$, but $Comp(X \cup t_2) = X \cup t_2$ and $Comp(X \cup r_2) = X \cup r_2$.

Proposition 5 *Let $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{D}}$ be a CCS system and $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{D}}$ such that $|\mathcal{H}| \geq 2$, every $H \in \mathcal{H}$ is maximal and there exist CCS $X = \bigcap_{H \in \mathcal{H}} H \neq \emptyset$, then $g(X) = X$ but X is not MCCS.*



Figure 4: A counter example: closed but non-maximal patterns

Proof. Since there exist more than two MCCS $H_i, H_j \in H$ we obtain $X \subset H_i$ and $X \subset H_j$. Therefore $H_i \setminus X \subseteq Comp(X)$ and $H_j \setminus X \subseteq Comp(X)$. However for $h_i \in H_i$ and $h_j \in H_j$ $Comp(X \cup h_i) \neq Comp(X \cup h_j)$ since otherwise it violates maximality of H_i. □

Let us introduce generalised Ferres relation of n-concepts.

Definition 10 *A relation $R \subseteq K_1 \times \cdots \times K_n$ is called a* ***generalised Ferrers relation*** *iff $\exists j \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \setminus \{j\}$ $A_{1i} \subset A_{2i} \subset A_{3i} \ldots \subseteq K_i$, and $K_j \supseteq A_{1j} \supset A_{2j} \supset A_{3j} \supset \ldots$ such that $R = \bigcup_k A_{k1} \times \ldots \times A_{kn}$.*

R is called a ***Ferrers relation of n-concepts*** *of $(K_1, \ldots, K_n, I)$ iff there are formal n-concepts $(A_{11}, \ldots, A_{1n}) \lesssim_k (A_{21}, \ldots, A_{2n}) \lesssim_k (A_{31}, \ldots, A_{3n}) \lesssim_k \ldots$ such that $R = \bigcup_i A_{i1} \times \ldots \times A_{in}$.*

Corollary 3 *Let $\mathbb{K} = (K_1, \ldots, K_n, I)$ be a polyadic formal context such that I is a Ferrers realtion of n-concepts and $\mathbb{D} = (E = K_1 \sqcup \ldots \sqcup K_n, t, \mathcal{R}, R)$ be the corresponding multi-relation database. Operator g does not produce a MCCS for $flat(A_{j1} \cap A_{i1}, \ldots, A_{jn} \cap A_{in})$ obtained from any pair of concepts of $\mathbb{K}$, $(A_{i1}, \ldots, A_{in}) \lesssim_k (A_{j1}, \ldots, A_{jn})$, where $i \neq j$ and $k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$.*

4. Closure operator for triconcepts

The fact that there are n-contexts where $h(\cdot)$ is not a closure that results in formal concepts because of non-idempotency and closure operator $g(\cdot)$ produces CCS that are not necessary maximal, e.g. caused by non-uniqueness of possible extensions of input patterns. Moreover, lossy enconding by k-partite graph instead k-partite hypergraph results in phantom k-adic edges and extra elements in resulting patterns.

So, to overcome the difficulty at least for generation of n-concepts we may adjust the set systems on that $h(\cdot)$ and $g(\cdot)$ operate. Informally, we need to weed all patterns or phantom hyperedges that result in undesirable behaviour of the closure operators.

Definition 11 *Let $\mathbb{K} = (K_1, K_2, K_3, I)$ be a triadic formal context. A triset S is called a (maximal) switching generator of the context $\mathbb{K}$ iff $S = tuple(flat(c_1) \cap flat(c_2)) \neq \emptyset$, where c_1 and c_2 are concepts of $\mathbb{K}$.*

Theorem 3 *Let $\mathbb{K} = (K_1, K_2, K_3, I)$ be a triadic formal context. The set system $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{K}\ominus\mathcal{S}} = \mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{S}$ is a correct set system for formal triconcept generation by $h(\cdot)$ in $\mathbb{K}$, where $\mathcal{T} = \{(X, Y, Z) \in 2^G \times 2^M \times 2^B \mid (X, Y, Z) \subseteq I\}$ and $\mathcal{S} = \{S \mid S$ is a switching generator of $\mathbb{K}\}$.*

Proof. Since there is no any switching generator in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{K}\ominus\mathcal{S}}$, monotony of $h(\cdot)$ is fulfilled.

Assume that monotony is violated by trisets x and y, that is $x \sqsubseteq y \rightarrow h(x) \not\sqsubseteq h(y)$. By extensivity of $h(\cdot)$ and transitivity of $\sqsubseteq$, it implies $x \sqsubseteq h(x)$ and $x \sqsubseteq h(y)$. Hence, $x = tuple(flat(h(x)) \cap flat(y))$, i.e. x is a switching generator, the contradiction.

Since every formal triconcept is not a switching generator, none of triconcepts has been deleted from $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{K}\ominus\mathcal{S}}$.

□

As for phantom triadic edges, unfortunately it is not possible to delete them from $\mathcal{R}$ since each phantom triadic edge $\{e_i, e_j, e_k\}$ is composed by $\{e_i, e_j\}$, $\{e_j, e_k\}$, and $\{e_k, e_i\}$, which are parts of "real" triadic hyperedges.

Let $\mathbb{K}$ be a formal tricontext and $\mathbb{D}$ be the corresponding multi-relational database, $\mathcal{P} = \{tuple(e) \mid e = \{e_i, e_j, e_k\}$ is a phantom edge in $\mathcal{R}\}$ then the test whether an MCCS forms triset can be done as follows:

1. For MCCS s form $tuple(s) = (X, Y, Z)$.
2. Check whether $t = X \times Y \times Z \setminus e$ forms a triset of $\mathbb{K}$, where $e \in \mathcal{P}$.
3. If yes, then output t;
4. Delete s from output otherwise.

To make sure that t is a triconcept, one need to check $h(t) = t$.

Since traditionally closure operators were introduced for partial orders over set inclusion, we would like to avoid dealing with preoder $\sqsubseteq$ over trisets and work with set inclusion of their set representations instead.

For tricontext $\mathbb{K} = (K_1, K_2, K_3, I)$ we consider a family of operators

$$\{\sigma_{ijk} | \sigma_{ijk} : 2^{K_1} \times 2^{K_2} \times 2^{K_3} \to 2^{K_1} \times 2^{K_2} \times 2^{K_3} \text{ such that}$$

$$\sigma_{ijk} : (X_1, X_2, X_3) \mapsto (Y_1, Y_2, Y_3), \text{ where}$$

$$Y_i = (X_j \times X_k)^{(i)}, Y_j = (Y_i \times X_k)^{(j)}, Y_k = (Y_i \times Y_j)^{(k)} \text{ where } \{i, j, k\} = \{1, 2, 3\}\}.$$

The cardinality of the family is $3! = 6$ and $n!$ for its n-ary case generalisation.

Proposition 6 *Operators $\sigma_{ijk}(\cdot)$ are not commutative, i.e. $\sigma_{ijk}(\sigma_{lmn}(\cdot)) \neq \sigma_{lmn}(\sigma_{ijk}(\cdot))$ where $(i, j, k) \neq (l, m, n)$ and $\{i, j, k\} = \{1, 2, 3\}$.*

Proof. Consider the single trisets for the tricontext given below.

r_1

	t_1	t_2	t_3	t_4
u_1	×	×	×	×
u_2		×	×	×
u_3		×	×	×
u_4				×

r_2

	t_1	t_2	t_3	t_4
u_1		×	×	×
u_2		×	×	×
u_3			×	×
u_4				

r_3

	t_1	t_2	t_3	t_4
u_1				×
u_2				
u_3				
u_4				

The system of all switching generators S contains $s_1 = \{u_1, t_4, r_1\}$ and $s_2 = \{u_1, u_2, t_3, t_4, r_1\}$.

s_1 proves that $\sigma_{i__}(\cdot) \neq \sigma_{j__}(\cdot) \neq \sigma_{k__}(\cdot)$ and

s_2 proves that $\sigma_{ijk}(\cdot) \neq \sigma_{ikj}(\cdot)$ for $\{i, j, k\} = \{1, 2, 3\}$.

The fact that $\sigma_{lmn}\sigma_{ijk}(\cdot) = \sigma_{ijk}(\cdot)$ proves the proposition. □

Theorem 4 *For $\mathbb{K} = (K_1, K_2, K_3, I)$ and the associated triset system $\mathcal{T}$ there is no an associated closure operator in case there exist at least two concepts $c_1 = (X_1, Y_1, Z_1)$ and $c_2 = (X_1, Y_2, Z_2)$ such that they have the common non-empty maximal switching generator s, i.e. $tuple(flat(c_1) \cap flat(c_2)) \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. Let σ be a closure operator for $\mathbb{K}$. Since $s \sqsubset c_1$ and $s \sqsubset c_2$ then $\sigma(s)$ should result in c_i which is either c_1 or c_2 (or one of other concepts c_k with $s \sqsubset c_k$ if any exist). So let $\sigma(s) = c_i$ and consider $s \sqsubseteq c_j$ it implies that $\sigma(s) = c_i \not\sqsubseteq \sigma(c_j) = c_j$ for $i \neq j$, and $\{i, j\} = \{1, 2\}$. The contradiction. □

As it has been shown, $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{K}\ominus S}$ is a correct set system for $h(\cdot) = \sigma_{123}(\dot{c})$ being a closure operator. It is easy to see that this system is correct for $\sigma_{ijk}(\cdot)$.

To summarise properties of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{K}\ominus S}$ and show its difference from set systems in (Boley et al., 2010; Spyropoulou et al., 2014) we recall the following properties of set systems.

Definition 12 *A non-empty set system $(E, \mathcal{F})$ is called*

1. accessible if for all $X \in \mathcal{F} \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ there is an $e \in X$ such that $X \setminus \{e\} \in \mathcal{F}$,

2. an independence system if $Y \in F$ and $X \subseteq Y$ together imply $X \in F$,

3. confluent if for all $I, X, Y \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\emptyset \in I \subseteq X$ and $I \subseteq Y$ it holds that $X \cup Y \in F$.

4. strongly accessible if it is accessible and for all $X, Y \in F$ with $X \subset Y$, there is an $e \in Y \setminus X$ such that $X \cup \{e\} \in \mathcal{F}$.

Proposition 7 *1) Set system $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{K}\ominus S}$ of all sets that form trisets is accessible and 2) not independent. 3) It is not a closure system. 4) It is confluent. 5) It is strongly accessible.*

Proof. 1. Every set of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{K}\ominus S}$ forms a triset t. Even if it contains some switching generator s we can then remove any $e \in flat(s)$ from t, the resulting set $flat(t)\backslash e$ is in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{K}\ominus S}$ (switching generator free system) since it is a triset and contains at least one element not included in switching generator. Empty set (or empty set of triples) is not in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{K}\ominus S}$ because it is universal switching generator.

2. Since some concepts may contain switching generators by triset set inclusion, it implies that these switching generators are not $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{K}\ominus S}$.

3. On contrary every pair concepts $X, Y \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{K}\ominus S}$ implies that $X \cap Y \notin \mathcal{F}$ (anti-sharing).

4. Since there is no such non-empty $I \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{K}\ominus S}$ being a triset of two different concepts it trivially holds.

5. If $X \subset Y$ for $X, Y \in \mathcal{F}$, X does not form a formal concept (because of antiordinal relations) or switching generator. So adding any element e from $Y \setminus X$ leaves $X \cup \{e\}$ being a triset. □

Detailed study of algorithmic and complexity issues is out of scope the paper, however, in (Boley et al., 2010) there was reported a simple algorithm for problem 1 of listing fixed points of partially defined closure operator, which is correct for strongly accessible set systems.

Problem 1 *(list-closed-sets) Given a set system $(E, \mathcal{F})$ with $\emptyset \in \mathcal{F}$ and a closure operator $\sigma : \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{F}$, list the elements of $\sigma(\mathcal{F}) = \{F \mid F \in \mathcal{F} : \sigma(F) = F\}$.*

It is questionable whether the weeding step can be efficiently incorporated into closure listing algorithm. Thus, in the worst case, i.e. for power tricontext $\mathbb{K} = (\{1 \dots n\}, \{1 \dots n\}, \{1 \dots n\}, \neq)$, the number of ticoncepts equals 3^n. The number of switching generators is less but not polynomial and given in Theorem 5

Theorem 5 *For a power tricontext $\mathbb{K} = (\{1 \dots n\}, \{1 \dots n\}, \{1 \dots n\}, \neq)$ the number of switching generators is $4^n - 3^n$.*

Proof. One can prove the theorem by direct calculation of the triple sum below

$$\sum_{k_1=0}^{n-1} \sum_{k_2=0}^{n-k_1-1} \sum_{k_3=0}^{n-k_1-k_2-1} C_n^{k_1} C_{n-k_1}^{k_2} C_{n-k_1-k_2}^{k_3}.$$

□

Theorems 3,4,5 and propositions 7,6 can be generalised for n-ary case in a similar way.

5. Conclusion

We considered partially defined closure operators for triconcept generation. It is easy to obtain their n-adic versions and generalise current results. However, the open question at the moment is whether recent closure-based algorithms for pattern mining reported in the relevant literature may benefit from this new bit of knowledge. Another interesting result could be a polynomial time check whether the current context is switching generators free (excluding $\emptyset$) or has polynomial number of switching generators. Thus, one of the switching generators free examples is $\mathbb{K} = (\{1 \dots m\}, \dots, \{1 \dots m\}, =)$.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Loïc Cerf, Eirini Spyropoulou, Boris Schminke, Dmitry Gnatyshak, Sergei Kuznetsov, Sergei Obiedkov, Bernhard Ganter, Jean-Francois Boulicaut, Mehdi Kaytoue, Amedeo Napoli, Boris Mirkin, Lhouri Nourine, Engelbert Mephu Nguifo and Jaume Baixeries. The work was partially supported by RFBR and HSE.

References

Boley, M., Horvth, T., Poign, A., & Wrobel, S. (2010). Listing closed sets of strongly accessible set systems with applications to data mining. *Theoretical Computer Science*, (pp. 691–700).

Cerf, L., Besson, J., Robardet, C., & Boulicaut, J.-F. (2009). Closed patterns meet n-ary relations. *ACM Trans. Knowl. Discov. Data*, *3*, 3:1–3:36. URL: http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1497577.1497580. doi:http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1497577.1497580.

Ganter, B., & Wille, R. (1999). *Formal Concept Analysis: Mathematical Foundations*. (1st ed.). Secaucus, NJ, USA: Springer-Verlag New York, Inc.

Jäschke, R., Hotho, A., Schmitz, C., Ganter, B., & Stumme, G. (2006). Trias–an algorithm for mining iceberg tri-lattices. In *Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Data Mining* ICDM '06 (pp. 907–911). Washington, DC, USA: IEEE Computer Society. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/ICDM.2006.162. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/ICDM.2006.162.

Lehmann, F., & Wille, R. (1995). A triadic approach to formal concept analysis. In *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Conceptual Structures: Applications, Implementation and Theory* (pp. 32–43). London, UK: Springer-Verlag. URL: http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=645488.656867.

Simovici, D. A., & Djeraba, C. (2008). *Mathematical Tools for Data Mining: Set Theory, Partial Orders, Combinatorics*. Springer-Verlag London Limited.

Spyropoulou, E., Bie, T. D., & Boley, M. (2014). Interesting pattern mining in multi-relational data. *Data Min. Knowl. Discov.*, *28*, 808–849. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10618-013-0319-9. doi:10.1007/s10618-013-0319-9.

Trabelsi, C., Jelassi, N., & Ben Yahia, S. (2012). Scalable mining of frequent tri-concepts from folksonomies. In P.-N. Tan, S. Chawla, C. Ho, & J. Bailey (Eds.), *Advances in Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining* (pp. 231–242). Springer Berlin Heidelberg volume 7302 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-30220-6_20. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-30220-6_20.

Voutsadakis, G. (2002). Polyadic concept analysis. *Order*, *19*, 295–304.

Wille, R. (1995). The basic theorem of triadic concept analysis. *Order*, *12*, 149–158.

Zaki, M. J., & Hsiao, C. (2005). Efficient algorithms for mining closed itemsets and their lattice structure. *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.*, *17*, 462–478. URL: http://doi.ieeecomputersociety.org/10.1109/TKDE.2005.60. doi:10.1109/TKDE.2005.60.